

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,752	10/074,752 02/13/2002		Kieth G. Spitler	Mo6806/MD-99-39B-PU	9963
157	7590	03/25/2004	EXAMINER		INER
BAYER F	-	RS LLC	COONEY, JOHN M		
100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205		15205	ART UNIT I		PAPER NUMBER
ŕ				1711	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	- 	5K	
The state of the s	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,752	SPITLER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John m Cooney	1711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reposition of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/are 	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	` ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 <i>(</i> a	n)-(d) or (f)	
 a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea 	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Pority documents have been received In au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the centiled copies not receive	ea.	
Attachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0202.	Paper No(s)/Mail D		

Application/Control Number: 10/074,752

Art Unit: 1711

7

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioca et al. in view of Markusch et al.('051).

Cioca et al. discloses preparations of polyurea composites prepared from isocyanates having NCO group contents and functionalities as claimed, water, and additive materials under heated molding/shaping conditions which read on the work-up conditions claimed (see column 2 line 11 – column 4 line 32, the examples, as well as, the entire document). Though the specifics of viscosities of isocyanates are not referred to by Cioca et al., such is not seen to be an element of distinction because owing to the overall similarities between the described features disclosed this additional element is seen to be inherent to Cioca et al.'s disclosure.

Cioca et al. does differ from the claims in that it does not specifically recite hollow spheres as a potential additive. However, Markusch et al.('051)(see column 9 lines 19-60, as well as, the entire document) discloses the interchangeable usage of inorganic beads and wood chips/dust in the making of closely related isocyanate-based article formations. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have interchangeably employed the inorganic beads of Markusch et al. in place of the wood flakes/dust of Cioca et al. as motivated by the reasonable expectation that they will behave comparably in order to arrive at the products and processes of

Art Unit: 1711

applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results. It is prima facie obvious to substitute equivalents, motivated by the reasonable expectation that the respective species will behave in a comparable manner or give comparable results in comparable circumstances. *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343; *In re Jezel* 158 USPQ 99; the express suggestion to substitute one equivalent for another need not be present to render the substitution obvious. *In re Font*, 213 USPQ 532.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kossatz et al. and Rosthauser are cited for their disclosures of relevant NCO group contents in related preparations. Markusch et al. ('720) is cited for its discussion of the isocyanate water reaction in polyurea synthesis. Schwab et al. discusses water as an extender in isocyanate based syntheses.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN M. COONEY JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER